Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

eral States, in order to determine whether this is so.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the most serious shortcoming at present is that there is no single body which can receive and investigate complaints against Federal judges. This means that such complaints come to a variety of offices, already overworked and lacking the staff and expertise to make a fair evaluation, and, of course, without any power to take appropriate action. As a result, charges are bandied about in the press on the basis of incomplete information. This is unfortunate for judges, the judicial system and the public. Not only should the public have an opportunity to have legitimate complaints considered, but a judge should have an opportunity before a proper tribunal to clear himself from unfounded charges, and the judiciary should not unnecessarily suffer the disrespect that unfounded charges often produce.

Therefore, one possibility which our subcommittee intends to consider very seriously is the establishment of an independent commission to deal with judicial fitness at all stages from nomination through removal, with jurisdiction to receive complaints, investigate cases, and make recommendations to the appropriate decisionmaking authorities. The existence of such a body might go far to improve judicial performance, to eliminate irresponsible and unfounded charges against the judiciary, and consequently to raise the stature of the Federal courts in the eyes of the public.

Mr. President, the problem of the unfit judge is a serious challenge to our judicial system. Adequate solutions will not be easy to find. But I believe it is an area that will reward the type of exhaustive study our subcommittee is prepared to undertake, and I am hopeful that at the conclusion of our inquiry we will be able to produce helpful legislation in this field.

ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS OF CONCERN TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE

There are numerous other problem areas, Mr. President, that I intend to have the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery look into in some detail over the future months. In brief scope, I would like to let the Members of the Congress, the bench, and the bar know what they are.

First, there is an apparent need for consolidation of the correctional functions of the Federal judicial system. At present our Federal probation and parole systems are fragmented in their operation, without any central direction, coordination, or supervision. The various probation officers, the Bureau of Prisons, and the Department of Justice's Parole Board perform, independently, functions that are by nature vitally related. There is a good case, I believe, that can be made for better coordinating our correctional services, but the exact nature and form that any consolidation should take must be explored.

Next, there is much uncertainty concerning Federal habeas corpus procedures and the statutory postconviction remedy afforded by section 2255 of title 28 of the United States Code. Then there is the matter of bail reform and the related problem of preventive detention. The Senate has just passed the omnibus bail reform bill of 1965, S. 1357, which is a studied effort to meet the problems posed by our presently outdated Federal bail system. The related problem of preventive detention is, Mr. President, a most difficult one. It has become evident that one of the major problems in the war against crime is that posed by persons who, already accused of one crime, are free on bail pending trial. Experience has shown that, in many instances, such persons commit additional offenses during the pretrial period. Whether anything can be done in this area in light of evident constitutional problems posed by the prospect of detention before conviction is unclear, yet it is imperative that we undertake a full-scale study of the problem.

There are many who think that, if preventive detention procedures are attended by adequate guarantees of an expedited trial, and if procedural due process is afforded the accused who is "preventively detained," such an approach can be squared with the constitutional right to trial by jury and the presumption of innocence. If so, society may be spared much agony that otherwise might occur. Our subcommittee together with Senator ERVIN's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, has already announced hearings on the preventive detention problem.

Mr. President, the subcommittee is also aware that the "fair trial-free press" problem is becoming more acute as every year passes. Supreme Court decisions, the most recent of which was *Estes v. Texas*, 381 U.S. 532 (1965), decided only last term, make clear that the right of the individual to a fair trial must be preserved and that some accommodation must be reached between the legitimate interests of the news media and the right of a defendant to a trial free from the effect of prejudicial publicity.

Numerous problems surround the selection of Federal jury panels. There are many ambiguities in the current system, and rules and procedures vary widely from district to district. Increased supervision of the jury selection process should be exercised by the district judge, and close scrutiny should be given to this process to determine whether it provides adequate assurance that Federal juries will be impartially and fairly selected. Without such assurance the quality of Federal justice will be less than it must be.

Next, the subcommittee would like to look into the present method of choosing chief judges for the circuits and districts. The selection is currently based solely on seniority, and the chief judge automatically loses his position as chief judge on reaching the age of 70 whether he chooses to retire as judge or not. It has been suggested that since the chief judge has certain important administrative duties, the selection should be made on the basis of merit and special qualifications, rather than seniority.

One of the most important areas which our subcommittee intends to study is the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, particularly the jurisdiction based upon diversity of citizenship. Federal courts throughout the country have been faced in recent years with an ever-increasing caseload, and some judges and lawyers have come to the conclusion that the only way to accomplish a substantial reduction of this tremendous caseload is to curtail or even eliminate the diversity jurisdiction. A committee of the American Law Institute, under the direction of Prof. Richard Field of the Harvard Law School, has been studying the diversity jurisdiction problem for the past several years, and it is anticipated that the results of that study and the recommendations of the institute will soon be available. At that time, I hope that our subcommittee will be prepared to undertake the very large task of evaluating the desirability of legislation to amend the diversity jurisdiction.

A related problem is the very heavy caseload of the Supreme Court. Although the Supreme Court has the power to limit the number of casese it take up through the denial of writs of certiorari, in some situations it is faced with direct appeals from decisions of the district courts—cases that, unlike the normal case, do not pass through an intermediate stage at the level of the Court of Appeals. In one of these areas, that of antitrust under the Expediting Act, it has been suggested that the direct appeal be eliminated and that the traditional role of the Court of Appeals be reinstated. Our subcommittee will look into this problem.

In addition, the subcommittee also hopes to give continuing attention to proposals for changes in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. In the past, when the Supreme Court of the United States has laid before the Congress proposals for changes in the rules, these proposals have perhaps received less attention from the Congress than should have been given. Since these rules provide the basic procedural framework for the administration of Federal justice, the Congress has a responsibility to examine the proposed changes with care before permitting them to become effective.

In recent weeks, our subcommittee has been involved in several matters affecting the Court of Claims. There was, first, the proposal to add two new judges to the Court of Claims, and to permit the Court of Claims to sit in panels as well as en banc, which our subcommittee reported favorably and which passed the Senate last month.

Second, the subcommittee has been concerned with the problem of the congressional reference cases—private relief bills submitted to the Congress involving complicated questions of fact which, in the past, had been referred to the Court of Claims for advisory opinions.

The Court of Claims is now unwilling to render such advisory opinions to the Congress, being of the opinion that this function is inconsistent with the court's status as an article III tribunal. Together with Representative CELLER's Committee on the Judiciary of the House

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

of Representatives, and the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice, the subcommittee has been trying to work out another method of dealing with these cases. I hope that we will be able to announce a workable solution in the very near future.

The boundaries of the several judicial circuits, Mr. President, were drawn many years ago, and now the volume of judicial business varies materially from circuit to circuit. Of course, additional judges have been added to particular circuits as their caseloads have increased. But there is some feeling that there may be a point beyond which a circuit has too many judges to be manageable, and that, therefore, the geographical boundaries of the circuits should be redrawn to prevent this from happening. Also, there are several circuits where the geographical area encompassed is great, and where the distances between litigant and courthouse can be immense. The geographical boundaries of the circuits is a problem within the mandate of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, and I expect that in the not too distant future we will examine and evaluate the arguments for and against retaining the status quo.

The problem of pretrial, prearraignment procedures, which will play an important part in our study of the U.S. commissioner system, may also be the subject of an independent inquiry of its own. The proper way to protect the rights of suspected persons, without depriving law enforcement authorities of adequate means of apprehending criminals, is a subject of great controversy and great importance.

The efficiency of the Federal courts is at times impaired by the fact that litigants are forced to try their case in a district which may not be the most convenient for the parties and witnesses. A provision of the Judicial Code, section 1404(a) of title 28, providing for discretionary transfer from one district to another under certain circumstances, was interpreted rather narrowly by the Supreme Court in the case of *Hoffman* v. *Blaski*, 363 U.S. 335, decided in 1960. The suggestion has been made that judicial efficiency would be increased if this provision for transfer were broadened to cover a greater number of cases. This is an area which I think our subcommittee might usefully explore.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to mention several other problems with which we hope to deal at some time in the near future: possible reform of present law prescribing the method of the service of process with respect to actions in Federal courts; creation of a special aviation jurisdiction akin to the present maritime jurisdiction, pursuant to a multilateral convention to which the United States is a party; a study of the savings clause problem in the admiralty jurisdiction—that is, whether *The Tungus*, 358 U.S. 588 (1959), should be overruled by statute; criminal discovery; the problem of senior judges; additional staff for courts, judges, and U.S. attorneys; the problem of appellate review of sentences.

Obviously, Mr. President, not all of the many areas I have alluded to are of equal importance, nor are they in equal need of study and reform. Nor do I suggest that this list exhausts the problems in the Federal judicial system that merit thorough scrutiny by the subcommittee.

I have taken the liberty of discussing these topics at perhaps excessive length for the purpose of alerting the Members of Congress, the bench, and the legal profession, to the type of matter that the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery will be studying over the coming months. I want to reiterate at this time that we will welcome any advice and counsel—including suggestions for additional areas that need attention—that we may receive from our colleagues in the Congress, from members of the Federal judiciary and from the bar at large. I urge everyone who is interested in improving and maintaining the health of the Federal judicial system to assist us in this important enterprise.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have listened to much of the Senator's speech, and I shall read it in tomorrow's RECORD with great interest, but I wish to say at this time that we are fortunate to have the Senator from Maryland as chairman of a subcommittee that will be reviewing the whole subject of how the judicial process of criminal justice functions. We are fortunate because of the Senator's experience as a U.S. attorney. We are fortunate because of his keen interest in this subject and his being a student of it. We are also fortunate that the Senator has made this one of the major subjects of his interest in the Senate.

I serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia with the Senator from Maryland, and I know of his great interest in the whole question of law enforcement problems. I want to associate myself with his objectives. The points he has made in his speech which I have heard are deserving not only of being discussed, but of having a determination by the Senate with regard to a legislative program as a result of his conduct of a review of this subject.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I join my colleague, the Senator from Oregon in commending the Senator from Maryland. Although I have heard some of the speech, I intend to read the Senator's speech with greater care; but I know what he is talking about. I am in support of his chief objective. The Senator from Maryland has already become an outstanding Member of this body. His accomplishments in many fields are great. This particular subject is illustrative of the kind of work he does. I compliment him.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and the distinguished Senator from Oregon for their kind comments. I hope they and other Senators will lend assistance in this effort, because we need all the help we can get.

THE SOVIET CONSULAR CONVENTION, THE RUMANIAN RUBBER DEAL, AND THE QUESTION OF EXTREMISM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, before the session draws to a close, there are some further observations that I would like to make on the question of the Soviet consular convention and the question of trade with the satellite countries.

I link these two questions together because the charge has been made by some that the John Birch Society and other extremist groupings are somehow responsible both for the mounting opposition within the country to the ratification of the consular convention with the Soviet Union and for the cancellation of the Goodyear Rubber contract to build a synthetic rubber plant for the Rumanian Communist government.

I feel that these charges are most regrettable because they carry with them the unescapable implication that in some manner those who oppose ratification of the consular convention have been reached or influenced by the John Birchers or other extremists.

I assume that Congress has received a fair amount of mail opposing ratification of the consular convention because my own office has received a substantial amount of mail on this subject.

I also assume that the John Birch Society has had something to do with these communications because the society has been urging its adherents to write and has been putting out some rather fancy claims about the number of letters they have written.

Every Member of Congress welcomes mail from his constituents because it helps him to make up his mind on important issues. But it is not very difficult to detect an organized letter writing campaign. This is a knack, indeed, which most Members develop during their freshman year in Congress. I am therefore convinced that every Member of the Senate, whether he supported or opposed the consular convention, was aware of the origin of the John Birch campaign and did not attach much weight to these many identically worded or similarly worded communications.

Despite the inflated estimates put out by the John Birch Society about their ability to influence Congress, I am absolutely certain that the John Birch Society has about as much influence in the Halls of Congress as the Ku Klux Klan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as a personal note, I might again remind my colleagues that the John Birch Society in a recent bulletin assailed me as—and I quote their words directly—"By far the

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

most persistent, continuous, aggressive, and damaging, enemy the society has had in the U.S. Senate.

THE REASONS AGAINST THE CONSULAR CONVENTION

I opposed the consular convention not so much because of any mail I may have received urging my opposition, but for the simple reason that I considered the convention morally wrong, politically mistaken, and potentially disastrous in its consequences.

To the argument that the convention was not very different from the consular conventions we had concluded with other countries, I replied that the other countries with whom we have such conventions are not committed to our destruction and are not engaged in worldwide subversive activities against the free world.

To the argument that the convention would improve communications between our two countries, I replied that it would do no such thing, because it is not the business of consulates to communicate or to negotiate.

And to those who argued that such an exchange of consulates would further the process of mutual understanding, I replied that the establishment of a series of Soviet consulates on American soil would inevitably fan American suspicion because of the incurable addiction of Soviet diplomats for espionage.

I want to make it clear that I do not believe that the security of our country stands or falls on the establishment of a few Soviet consulates in our major cities.

I have no doubt that the Soviets would use these consulates primarily for purposes of espionage.

But the evidence indicates that the espionage apparatus already maintained by the Soviets in this country is the most massive ever maintained by one country in the territory of another.

I, therefore, doubt that the establishment of a few consulates would enhance the overall effectiveness of the Soviet espionage apparatus by a factor of more than 5 or 10 percent.

The threat posed to our own security by the establishment of a few Soviet consulates would be of limited and manageable propositions. But it would pose a threat of a far greater magnitude to the security of the Americas.

So far, the countries of Latin America, while recognizing the Soviet Union, do not have consular conventions with it.

The acceptance of Soviet consulates in our own country would, I am convinced, inevitably lead to a proliferation of Soviet consulates throughout the troubled countries of Latin America. In these countries, the chief functions of the Communist diplomatic establishments is not espionage; it is, as more than one Latin American government has discovered, the direct support of subversion.

Given the increasingly precarious political situation throughout the Americas, we must shun like the plague any diplomatic innovation which will enhance the Communist capability for subversion.

For all of these reasons, I am convinced that we need Soviet consulates in this hemisphere approximately as much as we need a hole in the head.

It troubles me to have to oppose the administration on the ratification of an agreement which it has negotiated.

But conscience demands that I take a stand against a measure which, I am convinced, can produce no conceivable good, but will instead spawn a host of evil consequences.

In a statement on the floor last week, I pointed out that, in the heat of debate, all of us are prone to make exaggerated statements which we later regret.

It is my earnest hope that in the continuing debate on the consular convention, we will be able to discuss the matter on its merits and to avoid charges of procommunism on the one side and of "John Birch influence" on the other side.

There has already been far too much of this.

THE QUESTION OF TRADE WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

The press of Tuesday, October 12, reported that six major U.S. cigarette manufacturers have defied threats of a consumers' boycott aimed at ending their imports of tobacco from Communist Yugoslavia. It also reported that the cigarette firms have received letters from the administration warning that yielding to pressure groups that threaten economic reprisals for carrying out lawful trade "is to encourage capricious interference with the vital processes of our constitutional government."

Now, there are three basic positions on trade with Communist countries.

There are those who believe in unlimited trade.

There are those who believe in no trade at all.

And there is an in-between category which is not opposed to all trade but which holds that major concessions on trade, especially in the sphere of heavy industrial or strategic goods, should be accompanied by political concessions from the other side.

I have always considered myself a member of this third category. I have no serious objection to the purchase of tobacco or furs or other such commodities from the Communist countries, nor do I seriously object to the sale of certain consumer goods to them. But when it comes to selling them heavy industrial equipment or entire factories or to selling them massive quantities of wheat with which to offset their grave food deficiency, I think it is the height of folly, as I have said on many previous occasions, not to exact certain elementary political concessions in return for the favor we are doing them.

But however we may feel about trade with the Communist countries, I do not think that we can properly take the stand that citizens groups should be discouraged from expressing their viewpoint if it conflicts with Administration policy or that citizens are not within their rights when they organize to boycott goods coming from certain countries.

I recall that in the thirties there was no national prohibition on trade with Nazi Germany. But there was a very active and very successful citizens' movement to boycott Nazi Germany, which operated with complete toleration. Of this movement, I might say incidentally, I counted myself a supporter.

THE RUMANIAN RUBBER DEAL

In his statement on July 25, 1965, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee sharply criticized the Goodyear Rubber Co. for refusing to build a synthetic rubber plant for the Rumanian Communist government.

He rebuked the Firestone Rubber Co. for consenting to build the plant and then reversing its decision because of an adverse public opinion reaction. And he described the Young Americans for Freedom, the organization chiefly responsible for publicizing the rubber deal, as an "extremist," vigilante group.

The question raised by the senior Senator from Arkansas in this case involved more than a determination of the propriety of decisions taken by two American business firms.

I hope that I have misread the Senator's intent, but it seemed to me that his remarks carried the strong inference that the question of developing trade with the Communist-ruled states of Europe is no longer open to controversy.

Actually, as the President's Special Committee on U.S. Trade Relations With East European Countries pointed out in sumarizing the case for and against such an expansion, "there are persuasive elements" in the arguments on each side.

"No one policy is wholly right or wholly wrong," said the committee, "and any course chosen has its own risks."

And just as it would be wrong to take the stand that all those who favor increased trade with the Communist countries are pro-Communist or "soft on communism," it is completely contrary to the facts to suggest that those who oppose such expansion are rightwing extremists whose activities merit investigation.

Even within the liberal political community there are sharply divergent views on the advisability of increased East-West trade.

The executive council of the AFL-CIO has come out strongly against expanded trade with the Communist countries.

In addition, liberal scholars of national reputation, like Dr. Hans Morgenthau and Dr. Zbigniew Brzeszinski, have taken the stand that any expansion of East-West trade should be made conditional on political concessions from the Communist side.

Finally, in addition to myself, the senior Senator from Illinois, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, and the senior Senator from Kentucky, have all warned against an unconditional expansion of East-West trade.

The President's special committee made this point:

> The committee does not believe that many U.S. firms would be interested in selling their most advanced technology. They bargain hard for satisfactory terms for such technology as they are willing to sell. These practices would hold all the more for trade with Communist countries.

Further on the report pointed out that:

> The President should use his authority to permit the sale of nonstrategic technology

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

in support of U.S. trade negotiations with individual Communist countries. The decision to permit the sale is a Government decision to be made on foreign policy grounds. The decision to sell and the terms of sale of such machinery and equipment should be left to the individual U.S. business firms.

This view is restated in recommendation 12 of the committee:

Trade with Communist countries should not be subsidized, nor should it receive official encouragement. The U.S. Government should decide the permitted scope of the trade in terms of security considerations. Within these limits, the amount of trade that takes place should be left to the U.S. business and the U.S. consumer to decide.

These views were agreed upon and released last May by the very distinguished panel of business and community leaders who make up the Special Committee, under the chairmanship of J. Irwin Miller. Mr. Euguene R. Black and Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt were among its members.

Judged in the light of these wise ground rules, the actions of both the Goodyear Co. and the Firestone Co. in refusing to sell a synthetic rubber plant to Rumania was unchallengably proper.

The case against the unconditional expansion of East-West trade was clearly stated in the March 1, 1965, statement of the AFL–CIO executive council. Let me quote what they said:

1. The Communist governments are seeking expanded trade with and long-term credits from Western democracies in order to overcome their economic plight.

2. The record shows that, in seeking expanded economic relations with the West, Communist governments have been motivated primarily by a desire to strengthen their economic system and totalitarian rule rather than by serious concern for speeding the improvement of the living conditions of the people.

3. There is no reason for American businessmen to join in a mad scramble for trade with Communist countries.

4. There is no foundation to the myth that the expansion of Western trade will promote the liberalization of any Communist government or encourage the separation of the satellites from the U.S.S.R.

The real problem in expanding East-West trade is not that of the normal exchange of goods.

As was pointed out by the President's Special Committee:

Foreign exchange rather than present U.S. export controls, is the major limitation on the potential for this trade.

According to the Special Committee, the Eastern European regimes saw in trade with the West a means of hastening economic growth and meeting planned goals. They were interested mostly in advanced technology.

At this time and over the near future, these countries are unlikely to increase substantially their sales in the United States or their convertible foreign exchange holdings earned from trading with Western Europe.

The President's Special Committee said that it is up to the Communist regimes to create conditions which would make possible serious long-term growth in United States-Eastern Europe trade.

Let me quote again from their report:

They would have to be prepared to invest in new export industries, to learn new marketing methods, to build dealer and service organizations abroad, and to develop relations of confidence with U.S. business firms. Such positive actions move a country to participate in the world economy and to abide by generally accepted international practices. They are intimately related to a nation's world outlook and are evolutionary in nature.

THE SITUATION IN RUMANIA

The real question to be asked is whether the several ostensible gestures of independence on the part of the Rumanian regime are secondary phenomena or whether they have basic significance, whether they are stratagems intended to encourage Western trade and Western credits, or whether they are true indications of a resolve to participate in the world of commerce, and, in the words of the Miller committee, to display an intensified concern "with internal standards of living, rather than with external adventures."

It is true that there are many commentators who are convinced that Rumania has moved very far along the road to independence from Soviet control.

On the other hand, there are some expert observers on Eastern Europe who question the validity of certain actions that have been construed as manifestations of independence.

In addition, the Rumanian Government itself has, in recent months, taken a number of actions which hardly square with the thesis that Rumanian communism is developing into a special breed that should not be identified with Soviet communism.

Let me set forth here certain facts about Rumanian communism and the Rumanian Communist Government which, in my opinion, deserve more serious consideration than they have been given in determining our policy toward Rumania.

First. On July 19, 1965, at the Fourth Communist Party Congress, Nicolae Ceansescu, the Secretary General of the Rumanian Communist Party "spent almost 3 minutes denouncing imperialist aggression in Vietnam" according to a report of David Binder, in the New York Times for July 21, 1965.

Next day, said Mr. Binder, the head of state, State Council President Chivu Stoica, "inserted a vitriolic attack on the U.S. Vietnam policy into a discourse on electric power development. His implication was that an increase in Rumanian power production would hearten the anti-imperialist forces."

There is also the fact, recently confirmed by the New York Times, that, ever since the suppression of the Greek-Communist insurrection, the Greek Communist Party has continud its subversive operations directed by headquarters in Rumanian territory, and supported by Communist broadcasts in the Greek language also originating in Rumanian territory. In a very direct sense, therefore, the Communist Government of Rumania bears a heavy share of responsibility for the recent disorders that have been plaguing Greece.

At the same congress the previous decision to send material help to North Vietnam was reaffirmed.

Second. While Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria are experimenting with less rigid planning methods and Poland and Hungary are actively studying similar changes, Nicolae Ceansescu, the Rumanian Communist leader, defiantly announced that decentralization of State authority "was not Rumania's way of doing things."

Third. The economic policy of the Rumanian Communist Party remains faithful to its Stalinist prototype. The stress is still on "a system geared more for military power than for human welfare".—report by President's special committee.

Fourth. Agricultural collectivization was completed over the past 3 years against Moscow's advice. Even within the so-called socialized sector of agriculture, which constitutes more than 90 percent of the land, the State farms get 40 percent of the investment funds although they hold only 15 percent of the land.

The individual lot which the peasant is permitted to till is barely one-half acre—the smallest in any European Communist country. On this the peasant manages to produce one-third of the national vegetable output, close to 50 percent of beef, pork, and dairy products, and 80 percent of the poultry and eggs.

The peasants make up 71.7 percent of the population but get only 28.3 percent of the national revenue.

Fifth. The average salary of the industrial worker is $63 per month. Of this, close to 70 percent goes for food. It takes a skilled worker 1 week of work to earn the price of a pair of shoes and 10 hours to pay for a pound of meat.

Sixth. It is noteworthy that even in the 1956–58 period, when in response to the Hungarian revolution, the stress was temporarily transferred in all Eastern European countries to the output of consumer goods, Rumania did not follow suit

Seventh. Much has been said about the Western orientation of Rumanian foreign trade. The years since 1959 have witnessed a substantial growth in trade between the Soviet Union and the Eastern European satellites on the one hand and the Western nations on the other hand.

In the case of Rumania, Western European credits have made a marked contribution to the overall expansion of trade with the West. For example, Rumanian imports in 1961 and 1962, exceeded exports by $106.6 million. The indications are that the bulk of this was made up of Western credits.

Eighth. Soviet economic exploitation through overcharged Soviet exports and underpriced imports from the captive area seems to continue unabated. It has been estimated that in 1962 Rumania lost $161.8 million in this way, and the figure for 1963, the last year for which official Soviet foreign trade statistics are available, is slightly higher.

As long as this form of exploitation continues—and there is no evidence that the practice has been discontinued—

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

credits to Rumania indirectly subsidize the Soviet Union.

These are but a few facts in support of the contention that a policy of unconditional Western credits— short- or long-term—would enable the European Communist governments to forego those reforms in the structure and operation of their economy which are called for if they are to overcome the serious problems they are now confronted with.

Left to their own devices these regimes would be compelled by necessity to drop some of their politically motivated economic policies, such as collectivization of agriculture or rigid and centralized planning in industry.

This would result not only in more attention to the people's welfare but also in a dispersal of power.

This would be a salutary political development because a government which is more responsive to the needs of the people and whose powers are less concentrated is, to that degree, less prone to engage in subversive or aggressive adventures in its foreign policies.

I have taken the trouble to set forth the facts in some detail because I think that the facts are sufficient to make it possible for completely reasonable citizens to take a stand against the proposed sale of a synthetic rubber plant to the Rumanian Government and against other similar measures which would serve to enhance the overall industrial capacity of the Communist bloc.

I have many differences on questions of domestic policy with the Young Americans for Freedom. But they were acting completely within their rights as citizens in opposing the Firestone rubber deal and in bringing pressure to bear on the Firestone Co. in support of their views.

We have accorded every freedom of action to critics of our Vietnam policy, because this is the American tradition.

It is my hope that those who may disagree with the administration in other areas will not, in future, be denigrated as vigilantes, but will instead be granted the same freedom of criticism and the same liberty of action that we grant the critics of administration policy in Vietnam.

THE ANTI-VIETNAM PROTEST MOVEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have sent to the offices of every Senator a copy of a study entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-in Movement." This study was prepared, at my request, by the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

The study points out that:

The great majority of those who have participated in anti-Vietnam demonstrations and in teach-ins are loyal Americans who differ with administration policy in Vietnam for a variety of reasons, ranging from purely strategic considerations to pacifism.

On the other hand, the study points to the conclusion that:

The control of the anti-Vietnam movement has clearly passed from the hands of the moderate elements who may have controlled it at one time, into the hands of Communists and extremist elements who are openly sympathetic to the Vietcong and openly hostile to the United States, and who call for massive civil disobedience, including the burning of draft cards and the stopping of troop trains. This is particularly true of the national Vietnam protest movement scheduled for October 15–16.

I have been asked what evidence there is that the anti-Vietnam agitation and the teach-in movement have been infiltrated and are being manipulated by the Communists. There are a number of facts, all of them contained in the study, which, taken together, would, I believe, convince any reasonable person that this is so.

The mere fact that these demonstrations are being organized on a worldwide basis is, in my opinion, a complete giveaway. Pacifists and liberals do not maintain a worldwide apparatus. Only the Communists have a worldwide apparatus capable of inspiring or contriving simultaneous demonstrations in many countries.

Second, there is the fact that confidential American Communist Party directives to their members, which are reproducted in our study, instruct them to get into the movement and even target the organizations to be infiltrated.

Third, there is the fact that Moscow broadcasts have openly boasted that the Communists in every country are marching in the forefront of the anti-Vietnam protest movement.

Fourth, there is the fact that a number of long-time Communists have played and are playing a prominent role in the work of organizing these protest demonstrations.

The Communists are smart enough to have respected citizens heading up movements they support and appearing on their platform. But if you look closely, the hands of the real organizers become apparent.

For example, in May 1960, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy organized a mass rally at Madison Square Garden. The members of this committee are all eminently respectable citizens. So were the speakers at the mass rally. But it turned out that the actual organizer of this rally was one, Henry Abrams, a veteran member of the Communist Party. The same Henry Abrams, I note, is listed as the No. 1 staff member in charge of organizing the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade tomorrow. I have here an ad from the Trotskyite Communist newspaper, the Militant, in which Abrams' name is listed, and which appeals to all Trotskyites and radicals to turn out.

The subcommittee study at many points identifies known Communist participants and people with long and persistent records of association with Communist-front causes, who are playing a prominent role in the present anti-Vietnam agitation.

I hope that all of my colleagues will find the time to study this publication, because I believe it will give them a new insight into what is taking place this weekend in some 80 cities around the country.

PAGEANT MAGAZINE CALLS FOR COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the November issue of Pageant magazine, on pages 4 and 5, Gerald A. Bartell, publisher of Pageant magazine has written a "letter from the publisher," in which he calls for increased consideration of the futures of our cold war veterans.

Under the title of this editorial "So That These Brave Men Will Not Have Fought In Vain," the editor truly says with reference to the cold war GI bill:

It is not charity; it is morality. It is good sense economically and socially. It proved its value in two post war periods. It is one of the few national counterpoints in the recurring madness of war.

In this article, he states that it is essential that we support the cold war GI bill (S. 9) as well as other legislation for these veterans.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial entitled "So That These Brave Men Will Not Have Fought In Vain," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO THAT THESE BRAVE MEN WILL NOT HAVE FOUGHT IN VAIN

Amid the unceasing ideological soul searching that our Vietnam intervention has occasioned, we request a moment to plead for the GI.

We are sending him, in increasing numbers, to dismal duty. Surely a Saturday night in Saigon can be a world of excitement to a callow 20-year-old soldier—if he spends it on a date with a sloe-eyed oriental girl. The landscapes of southeast Asia and the seascapes of the South China Sea must be of absorbing interest to almost any young American male, and educational indeed. Becoming acquainted with the Vietnamese people offers a maturing experience.

But our fighting men are not sent to Vietnam for such worthwhile adventures. They know why they go and what may be expected of them. So do we. And it is time to look to the welfare of the GI upon whom we impose a heavy burden. I suggest that he deserves some of the Great Society treatment to which we have properly dedicated ourselves.

We therefore direct the attention of our citizens and lawmakers to the need for new legislative action that will give our servicemen overseas in that unfortunate land of slaughter, squalor, and misery—in a meager quid pro quo for their contribution to what is announced as our national purpose—the benefits accorded veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

As this issue of Pageant was going to press, Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, introduced a bill (S. 2127) that offers a free $10,000 GI insurance policy to each combat area fighting man. At a 1-day hearing before the Senate Finance Committee the bill was approved for consideration of the full Senate.

If, by the time this letter is in print, S. 2127 is not a law, it is because the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs refuses to go along with what it regards as a superficial, patchwork approach to a problem that demands a complete program, of which GI insurance is only one component.

Certainly a form of the Talmadge bill, which provides an equivalent of national service life insurance, is essential. But we must also undertake such programs as a generous mustering-out allowance to assist in the adjustment from military to civilian

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0

life, college or training school education underwritten by the Government, and low-interest loans.

If you are startled that our men in Vietnam are not covered by these basic benefits, you may be subject to a brace of surprises arising from the ticklish technical position of this war. Officially, the conflict in Vietnam is not regarded as an American war. Our troops are engaged in a massive assist to the South Vietnamese. Korea, you may recall, was designated by President Harry Truman as a police action. But even without the legalities, the men involved in that encounter were given essentially the same benefits as participants in World War II.

We are told that any special consideration granted servicemen stationed in Vietnam must then be granted to all others on cold war duty. But must this be so? The President has the power to declare a state of national emergency when flood, fire, or other disaster overtakes an area. In like manner he is able to declare a state of emergency upon serious threat to national security. This declaration should be sufficient, if specifically spelled out, to engender wartime welfare benefits to troops engaged in the designated action. To help our GI's now, such a Presidential proclamation should be made immediately.

It is also essential that we support long-range legislation proposed by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, author of the cold-war GI bill for which he has fought for 6 years. Senator YARBOROUGH is incensed at the unfairness of penalizing those engaged in military service. He told Pageant that "only 40 percent of draft-eligible men ever serve in uniform, and we need to put them on an equal footing with the 60 percent whose opportunity to further their education and careers are not interrupted by military duty."

Perhaps the most terrifying thought a soldier experiences is that of uncertainty, the unknown. He's not usually afraid of being shot at, for it's always someone else who is killed. But he does fear the unknown. We all do.

An orderly procedure of assists and encouragements to the soldiers who must do the Government's most hazardous work is important and appreciated. It tends to lift morale.

It is not charity; it is morality. It is good sense economically and socially. It proved its value in two postwar periods. It is one of the few rational counterpoints in the recurring madness of war.

GERALD A. BARTELL.

TEXAS AND PERU: AN ALLIANCE THAT HAS PROGRESSED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President: Last night I was privileged to attend a reception at the Peruvian Embassy hosted by the charming Ambassador and Mrs. Celso Pastor, on the occasion of the opening of a National Gallery exhibition of a fabulous treasure of Peruvian gold. Some of these articles are several thousand years old, some being the product of craftsmen of former peoples of Peru before the birth of Christ.

Many of these treasures have never been outside Peru before, and this outstanding exhibit projects the friendly relations which have existed between the United States and Peru.

I am especially interested in this exhibit, because Texas and Peru are official partners in the Alliance for Progress, and during our brief time as partners, many projects have been undertaken and successfully completed.

One example of what was done is described in the Dallas Morning News of July 31, 1965, under the title "One Hundred and Ninety-seven Dollars Admits Village to 20th Century," which outlines how Texans sent road equipment to Peru and with that equipment the village of Navan built a road which gave access to the 20th century and communication with the outside world.

There was an article in the Washington Post on October 3, 1965, describing the wonderful cultural exhibit from Peru on display at the National Gallery in Washington, a treasury of gold ornaments, gold jewelry, gold plates, gold goblets, and gold chalices, and many other gold things going back thousands of years, and also this photographic exhibit.

It was my privilege to visit Peru in 1962. Its ancient history and great culture makes it an honored leader in the Western Hemisphere.

To illustrate the success of the Texas-Peru Alliance of Progress, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Dallas Morning News of July 31, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with an article from the Washington Post of October 3, 1965, describing the wonderful cultural exhibit from Peru on display at the National Gallery in Washington.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, July 31, 1965]

SATURDAY SHOWCASE—$197 ADMITS VILLAGE TO 20TH CENTURY

(By Carlos Conde)

LIMA, PERU.—For more than 200 years the mainstream of life bypassed the people who lived in the mountain village of Navan. There was no road from their town to the main highway. It was only 6 miles distant, but to them it might as well have been a world away.

The only way to get down the mountain was a steep rocky mule path that was impassable at certain times of the year. Many lived and died in Navan without ever leaving it. They wove their own clothes and grew their own food. Only two people in the village could read and write.

Finally the town leaders decided to build a usable road.

They didn't want a lot of money or fancy engineering plans. They just wanted tools to do the job themselves. But picks cost about $5. They needed about two dozen of them and the same number of shovels. That would take $200. A villager didn't earn half that much in a year. How would they ever get that much money?

They asked the Peruvian Government for help. Navan, a town of 2,500 people, was small and insignificant. Few Peruvians even knew it existed. It was natural, therefore, for their request to get buried and lost in bureaucratic files.

Two years went by. The townspeople began to search elsewhere. Someone told them of a "gringo" group that might help them. They traced the group to the U.S. Agency for International Development in Lima. It was a bunch of Texans who called themselves "The Texas Partners of the Alliance." The Texas Partners bought the tools for them and the Navan citizens went to work.

Last May they finished the job. A truck loaded with potatoes chugged up the narrow, lumpy road to commemorate the event. Church bells rang, people cheered and dogs barked. For Navan it was the greatest day in its history.

Trucks now travel up and down the road to buy and sell products. Two government teachers have started reading and writing classes in the village. The Navan folks occasionally hit the road for a holiday in the nearby towns.

These people had never heard of "Texans" before. But they'll never forget them. They call Texans the "padrinos," or godfathers of their road.

And all it cost was $197.

The Texas Partners of the Alliance have been doing a lot of similar people-to-people diplomacy since the organization was founded in San Antonio in March 1964.

And they have proven most vividly that it doesn't take a lavish budget. Since 1964, they have spent a total of $5,397 on projects such as the Navan road construction. The U.S. Government has given $310,500,000 in aid in Peru.

Chairman of the Texas Partners is Edward Marcus of Dallas. In Peru, the program is coordinated by a Lima corporation attorney, Carlos Boza, through the U.S. AID offices.

The creed of the Texans is "Ayudense que nosotros los ayudaremos." It means, "We will help those who help themselves."

The Texas Partners was formed at the request of the U.S. State Department to give a personal touch to the Alliance for Progress program. Twenty-four States are engaged in similar programs in other South American countries.

The purpose of the Texas Partners is threefold: To initiate self-help projects for the Peruvians; to stimulate cultural exchange; and to encourage small investments.

Participating in the program are Texas civic clubs, high school organizations, labor unions, and business and professional groups.

"This type of partnership helps to assure the people of South America of our concern for their struggle to rise above poverty," said Banks Miller, Jr., the executive secretary of the Texas Partners. "It aims to give a sense of movement of the Alliance in the slums and the rural areas where help is most needed.

"Most important, it can buy time until the institutions building economic development programs of the Alliance can make themselves felt at the grassroots level."

Boza thinks the pocket-change aid program is turning out to be more effective than some of the multimillion-dollar projects undertaken by the U.S. Government.

"A $5 pick has more impact than a $5 million dam," Boza said. "Few participate directly in a $5 million structure. It's like a gift with very little intrinsic value. Peruvians are leery of a gift. They think a gift has hidden strings. But they understand the gesture of a pick."

"Texans have not made this an old-clothes program," Boza said. "They have helped us without making us feel like beggars and taking away our dignity as human beings."

The Texas Partners are moving at a faster pace than first expected. They have participated in 32 projects and have spent $5,397.11. They still need $1,075.51 for seven pending projects such as libraries, rooftops for schools, handtools, and kerosene lamps.

The partners are still developing their cultural and investment sections. In August, a Texas concert pianist will perform in Lima under the auspices of the partners. Delegations of Texans have made several trips to Peru to investigate investment possibilities.

Self-help projects are screened and recommended through AID offices in Lima and then forwarded to the partners office in Austin. The project is then assigned to a Texas civic club or school organization which raises the money.

Approved For Release 2005/08/16 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300040047-0